

TRANSLATORS' CENSORSHIP IN ENGLISH-INDONESIAN TRANSLATION OF DONALD DUCK COMICS

Issy Yuliasri

Semarang State University, Indonesia

issy.yuliasri@gmail.com

First received: 18 October 2016

Final Proof Received: 30 May 2017

Abstract

Not all aspects of Western culture, reflected in the language used in Walt Disney's *Donald Duck* comics, are acceptable in Indonesia. So, in translating the comics, the translators have to manipulate the text for it to be acceptable by the target readers and parents. This research aims at finding out censorship through the translation techniques used by the translators in translating the English humorous texts in the Walt Disney's *Donald Duck* comics into Indonesian and the reasons underlying the translators' choice of the translation techniques. It also aims at analysing whether or not the choice of the translation techniques affects the rendering of meaning, maintenance of humour, and acceptability of the translation. For these purposes a qualitative method was employed with content analysis technique and reader response analysis. Content analysis was used in comparing the source text (ST) and target text (TT) to find out the translation techniques used as a means of censorship and to find out the translators' reasons for choosing the techniques. Reader-response analysis was done to find out the readers' response to the rendering of meaning and maintenance of humour in the translation. The research findings discovered that the translators performed censorship through the dominant use of reduction and generalisation techniques so as to reduce sarcasm and insults. The interview with the publisher's Senior Editor also revealed that "decency" was the first priority in the translation decision making, followed by clarity of meaning and maintenance of humour. Further research to investigate other elements censored, and compared with other translated comics is recommended.

Keywords: censorship; Donald Duck comics; reduction; generalization; translation techniques

Indonesia is a highly populated country with approximately 240 million people of different religious and ethnic backgrounds, Moslems forming a majority (around 90%). Following colonization by the Dutch for over 350 years and then by the Japanese for about 3 years, it obtained its independence in 1945. During the Dutch colonial period there was censorship of the press especially on political arguments that were considered ideologically conflicting to the interest of the colonial power. Since its independence there has been censorship and banning of books containing the ideas of communism and any other content considered threats to the unity of the nation, that degrade the morality of the people such as those containing pornography, that look down on the President and those that may disturb the religious life of the people. However, there has not been any specific regulation on children's books. Only recently, with the publication of a comic book translated from Korean containing homosexuality, has there been more concern about children's books. A legislative process is now in progress to revise the law on books to specify what is allowed for children.

Comics from other countries have flooded Indonesia since the 1970's, and Walt Disney's *Donald Duck* comics are among the most popular ones. They are familiar to Indonesian children as the

cartoons are also on televisions. *Gramedia*, the largest publisher in Indonesia, is the publisher of the Indonesian translations of the *Donald Duck* comics. The translation is done by a team of translators and editors. At present the translating team consists of five translators, one Junior Editor, and one Senior Editor. The translators do translations following the translation brief, which are then proofread by the Junior Editor for grammar, punctuation and spelling. The Senior Editor then does the final editing by making some necessary changes for naturalness and acceptability. It is the Senior Editor who decides the final version of the translation.

The comics were firstly published in Indonesia in 1974. From 1974 to 2008 the comics were printed on 20.5 x 27.5 cm sized paper, but from 2008 to the present they have been printed on 18 x 15.5 cm sized paper. Each comic has 48 pages, 32 pages of which are coloured and 16 pages are in black and white. The publisher's vision with the Donald Duck comics was to provide entertaining readings for its readers, and its missions were to invite the readers to learn about the values of life as portrayed in the stories of the comics as well as enhance the readers' imaginations through the fantasies contained in the comics.

According to the data obtained from the publisher, the biggest segment of readers of the comics are children of 10-12 years of age (50%),

followed by those above 12 years (30%), those of 8-10 years (15%), and those of 6-8 years (5%). In other words, the readers are mostly children and teenagers. Adult readership is less than 30%. These readers are mostly from the big cities (70%), followed by medium-sized cities (20%), and smaller town areas (10%), and no record of those from villages. From the socio-economic point of view, the readers of the comics are children of the high-income (60%) and middle-income (40%) families. The data imply that the comics are prestigious as they are popular among the urban middle and upper class readers.

Considering that children and teenagers are the biggest segment of readers, the publisher has set up a translation brief to which the team of translators have to adhere when making their translations. This translation brief contains information on the main characters, their family and friends, their properties (cars, pets, horses, and even the casino owned by Uncle Scrooge, etc.), names of all the characters in the comics and their characteristics, and the guidelines on the format and mechanics of writing and grammar with examples of errors and corrections. It also gives explicit instruction for not using certain words such as *goblok* (stupid) or *tolol* (dumb/moronic). The team of translators must adhere to the guideline and the senior editor determines the final translated version referring to the guideline (translation brief). The manipulation done by the translators and editors by using different translation techniques to conform to the publishing house's translation brief may be categorized as the act of censorship.

This study was done to answer the following questions: (1) what translation techniques were used by the translators in translating the English humorous texts in the Walt Disney's *Donald Duck* comics into Indonesian and what were the reasons underlying the translators' choice of the translation techniques (2) How did the choice of the translation techniques affect the rendering of meaning, maintenance of humour, and acceptability of the translation?

A monolingual study on *Donald Duck* was done by Barker (1989), and bilingual study on English-Indonesian translation was done by Simanjuntak (2006), but none of them investigated the area of censorship. Studies on censorship in children's literature have been done; one of the recent studies was the one done by Lin (2016) on the State's censorship during Franco's dictatorship in Spain focusing on the translation of Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. No study was done on the censorship in Indonesian translation of children's literature, particularly on *Donald Duck* comics

In research on English-Indonesian translation of humorous texts in Walt Disney's *Donald Duck* comics (Yuliasri, 2011), it was found out that the

reduction and generalization techniques used were intended to reduce and moderate insults and sarcasm. In the interview, the publisher's Senior Editor stated that the decision on such choices was made intentionally. It was mentioned that the publisher and the translation team were committed to making their translations didactic, and so they had to consider what was acceptable in Indonesian culture. With the conservative culture, insults and sarcasm were among the aspects considered unacceptable for children in Indonesia, and so the translators had to reduce or generalize them. It was further stated that decency was the first priority, followed by clarity of meaning and maintenance of humour.

Humour and Translation of Humour

Humour is defined by Ross (1998) as something that makes people laugh or smile. Additionally, Apter (1985) suggests that humour may be stimulated verbally or non-verbally. Verbal humour, according to Ross (ibid) may be caused by ambiguity (phonetic, morphemic, lexical, or syntactical ambiguity), word play, and Grice's maxim flout. Based on various studies on humour, Dynel (2008) generalizes that humour is created from incongruity. There are various types of humour according to Audrieth (1998): blue humour, blunder, bull, burlesque, caricature, the catch tale, conundrum, epigram, exaggerism, the Freudian slip, hyperbole, irony, joke, nonsensism, parody, practical joke, recovery, repartee, satire, situational humour, switching, understatement, wisecracking, and wit. The *Donald Duck* comics contain a lot of wit or wordplay in the form of sarcasm, irony, and satire.

As humour may be language-specific and culture-specific, it is not easy to translate humour. As Chiaro (1992, pp. 84-85) states, "...jokes and word play do present some extra difficulties not encountered in translating straight referential prose, which, as we shall see, compare with the difficulties faced in the translation of literary texts and especially poetry." Sousa (2002, p. 23) also suggests the difficulty of translating humour, because what is humorous for the source text readers might not be humorous for the target text readers; what might cause laughter in one culture might not have the same effect in another culture. Even when there are no language constraints, presenting humour is not always easy. Thus, when translating humour, translators should have the ability of telling humour.

Censorship in Translation

In translating the *Donald Duck* comic to Indonesian, the Editors perform preventive censorship for acceptability of the comics, including the humorous utterances contained in the comics. According to the Cambridge International Dictionary of English, as cited in Scandura (2004, p. 1), censorship is "the practice of examining books, films, etc. and

removing anything considered to be offensive, morally harmful, or politically dangerous.” Another definition of censorship, as stated by Cohen (1999, p. i), is “the exclusion of some discourse as the result of a judgment by an authoritative agent based on some ideological predispositions”. From the two definitions, it can be concluded that censorship involves exclusion based on some sort of judgment or examination by an authoritative agent. Greenblatt as quoted in Wolf (2002) calls such an exclusion “blockage”. In her study, in the context of translation, Wolf (ibid) mentioned that textual manipulation and re-writing were among the exclusion processes or cultural blockages. Wolf (ibid) also suggests that censorship could occur at every stage, i.e. in the selection of texts to be translated, and in the selection of the translation strategies. In other words, it answers the questions of what to translate and how it is translated.

Schmidt, as quoted in Wolf (ibid), suggests that in translation process there are various factors that potentially operate in the constitution of blockages, i.e. the activity of “censors”, which relates to the roles and functions of editors and other agents involved in the translation process, the form of the mechanisms used to implement censorship decisions, the “degree of societal institutionalization of censorship activities”, and the “degree of internalization of censorship” or “self-censorship”. Leonardi (2008) suggests that translators could either have censorship imposed on them (external pressures) or choose to censor their own work (internal pressures). She further divides censorship into three categories, i.e. preventive censorship, practiced by the spiritual or secular authority by reviewing material before publication or dissemination in order to prevent, alter, or delay its appearance; repressive censorship, also done by spiritual or secular authority but after the printing or publishing of specific material considered subversive or damaging to the common good, in order to repress or ban it from circulating around the country, and self-censorship, which is the form of control imposed upon self out of the fear to annoy or offend others without being officially pressured by any authority. She also claims that translation may be subjected to several conscious acts of selection, addition and/or omission, and that text manipulation is often shaped by the readers’ taste and social position. In other words, translations are not really censored because of the pressure of the authority, but they are censored in order to make them more easily accessible to and accepted by the target readers. She also believes that “censorship could be positive in that it protects people from being exposed to any material which is deemed to be somehow immoral, offensive, heretical or blasphemous” (p. 84), although she also adds that too much of it may not allow for freedom of expression.

In the case of the Indonesian translation of the Donald Duck comics, it seems that the translation team performs preventive censorship in doing their translation task as imposed by the publishing house, using the editors to make sure of the adherence to the guidelines. As revealed from the interview with the Senior Editor, they manipulate the text in order to conform to the cultural norms for readers’ acceptability. Indonesian parents in general, as perceived by the translator team, would want their children to read material that has some educational and positive moral values. Consequently, what the translation team does in manipulating the text or censoring is partly shaped by what is expected by the parents, i.e. for educational and good moral values, which is also reflected in ‘decent’ language.

Translation Techniques

There have been different classifications of translation techniques, but in this study the translation techniques used were those under the classification proposed by Molina and Albir (2002), who define translation techniques as “procedures to analyse and classify how translation equivalence works (p. 509).” In this classification, there are 18 translation techniques, namely: (1) adaptation, (2) amplification, (3) borrowing, (4) calque, (5) compensation, (6) description, (7) discursive equivalence, (8) established equivalence, (9) generalization, (10) linguistic amplification, (11) linguistic compression, (12) literal translation, (13) modulation, (14) particularization, (15) reduction, (16) substitution, (17) transposition, and (18) variation. Molina and Albir’s classification of translation techniques was used as it can be used to analyse translation units smaller than sentences.

According to Molina and Albir (ibid), reduction technique means to suppress source text information in the target text. This is done by deleting or not translating part of the source text in the target text. An example is given when translating from English to Arabic the phrase “*Ramadan*, the Muslim month of fasting”, the Arabic translation is just “*Ramadan*”, leaving the descriptive phrase “the Muslim month of fasting”. The generalization technique, on the other hand, means to use a more general or neutral term. An example is given when translating the French words *guichet*, *fenêtre*, or *devanture* into English word “window”.

As censorship could involve the question of how a text is translated, it is therefore relevant to see how translation techniques are used (as censorship) to block or manipulate what is considered unacceptable or undesirable of an original text.

Previous Studies

According to Inge (1990), comics do not only contain important socio-cultural values, but are also a creative expression inseparable from other art forms. Barker (1989) believes that comics, like other

mass media, could bring ideology and influence the readers' ideology. An example of a previous study on Disney's comics is that of the Marxist criticism of Dorfman and Mattelart (Barker, 1989), which analysed how Uncle Scrooge liked to exploit Donald and his three nephews, Huey, Dewey, and Louie to make him even wealthier and with inhumane thrift. This, according to Dorfman and Mattelart, was a reflection of the dominance of Western imperialism over the Third World (Barker, 1989).

The above study was one of the monolingual studies on Walt Disney's comics. Besides the monolingual studies, there have been studies on the translations of the Walt Disney's comics in general and the *Donald Duck* in particular. One was made by Zitawi (2004), analysing the English-Arabic translation of the comics, specifically the politeness strategies of translators. Brown-Levinson politeness strategies were used, assuming the Disney's comics as the "face threatening text" (replacing the idea of "face threatening act" or FTA proposed by Brown-Levinson). The findings of the study revealed that the translator used the three politeness strategies proposed by Brown-Levinson, namely: "Don't do the FTA", "Do the FTA on record with mitigation" and "Do the FTA boldly with no mitigation."

Another study on the *Donald Duck* comics was made by Simanjuntak (2006), which specifically examined the Indonesian translation of the comics. In this study, the translation strategies and their effects on the quality of the translation were analysed. The research findings revealed that six strategies were used by the translator, namely structural adjustment, cultural borrowing, adaptation, maintenance, addition, and deletion. Those strategies resulted in accurate and acceptable translation, except the deletion which caused distortion of meaning. These studies have inspired the present study on the Walt Disney's *Donald Duck* comics, focusing on the censorship of the humorous texts.

METHOD

To answer the research questions, descriptive qualitative research was done using holistic criticism method which covered the objective, genetic, and affective factors (Sutopo, 2006). The objective factor involved the original English texts and the translated Indonesian texts; the genetic factor involved the translators and their reasons for choice of translation techniques; and the affective factor involved the target readers (and parents), and 'expert' group and their responses to the translation. Despite the qualitative nature of the research, frequency and percentage were used to give strong evidence of occurrence of the data studied.

The primary data were acquired from 21 Indonesian translated Walt Disney's *Donald Duck* comics published in Indonesia in 2008 and the

corresponding digital original English comics. From the 21 comics, 480 humorous texts comprising 480 humorous utterances were taken as the data, whose humour in English was confirmed by four native English speakers from Australia. The English and Indonesian humorous texts were then analysed to see the translation techniques used by the translators. Other primary data were obtained from the publisher's Senior Editor, who was asked to give the reasons for choosing the translation techniques of the 480 humorous utterances, and his statements were confirmed in a personal interview. In addition, the secondary data in the form of the publisher's translation brief gave further confirmation of the reasons behind the choice of the translation techniques. Finally, to see the effect of the translators' choice of translation techniques on the rendering of meaning, maintenance of humour, and acceptability of the language, investigation of the target readers' (and parents') and experts' responses on the translated comics was made. Three children and teenagers (8, 10, and 17 years old) were asked to read the 21 Indonesian translated comics with the humorous texts numbered from 1 to 480 as the data. A brief training session was given to the children on how to perform the evaluating task. They were then each given a form consisting of the 480 data of the humorous texts and asked to rate the clarity of meaning of the texts. They were asked to mark 3 if they found the text clear, 2 if it was not so clear, and 1 if it was not clear at all. At the same time, they were also asked to rate the humour. They were asked to mark 3 if the text was funny, 2 if it was not so funny, and 1 if it was not funny at all. A similar task was given to two parents of different educational levels in order to see how they assessed the appropriateness of the translated Indonesian language and the humour. This was meant to check the acceptability of the translation (in terms of acceptability of the language) and the maintenance of the humour. The parents were asked to mark 3 if the language of the humorous texts was appropriate for Indonesian children and teenagers, 2 if it was not so appropriate, and 1 if it was not appropriate at all. They were also asked to assess the humour. Similar to the children's assessment, they were asked to mark 3 if the text was funny, 2 if it was not so funny, and 1 if it was not funny at all.

In addition to my analyses of the rendering of meaning and maintenance of humour of the English-Indonesian translation of the humorous texts, two language 'experts', university lecturers (plus myself), who were both experts in English as well as Indonesian and have reasonable knowledge and experience of Western culture, were asked to assess the accuracy of the translation and the maintenance of humour. The two lecturers obtained their PhD's from English speaking countries, and they both had some considerable practical experience and research in translation. They were asked to read the 21

English comics and the corresponding Indonesian translations; the 480 humorous texts in the comics they read were marked with a highlighting pen and given numbers from 1 to 480 for ease of rating. They were each given a form to rate the accuracy of the translation and the maintenance of the humour. In assessing the accuracy of the translation, they were asked to mark 3 if the translation of the humorous text was accurate, 2 if it was not so accurate, meaning that part of the message was not rendered, and 1 if it was not accurate at all, and the meaning was distorted. Similarly, in assessing the maintenance of humour, they were asked to rate 3 if the humour was maintained in the translation, 2 if the humour was reduced, and 1 if the humour was lost.

The analyses of the translation techniques and the underlying reasons for choosing the techniques enabled us to see the censorship made through the translators' choice of the techniques and the priorities of the translators during the translating process. The analysis of the assessment made by the 'expert' group confirmed how such use of the techniques resulted in the accuracy of the rendering of meanings and maintenance of humour. Additionally, the analyses of the responses/assessment made by the children/teenagers and parents revealed the translation receptivity by the target readers. Triangulation of the data was expected to give a holistic picture of how the translation techniques used and the censorship made through them affected the rendering of meaning and maintenance of humour and how the translation gained receptivity by the target readers.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the English and Indonesian humorous texts in the *Donald Duck* comics revealed that the most prominent techniques used were discursive creation, which included re-creation, reduction, and generalisation. Other techniques were used less frequently. The data can be seen in table 1.

Of the 480 humorous utterances to which the Senior Editor gave the reasons for choosing the translation techniques, there were 12 reasons for choosing the 17 techniques, namely: clarity of meaning, limitation of space, easy comprehension, decency, adjustment to target readers' background knowledge, maintenance of humour, adherence to the translation brief, adjustment to the target readers' situation, following the translation brief, adjustment to Eastern culture, adjustment to the language of children/teenagers, and readability. In the interview, the publisher's Senior Editor confirmed that the prominent use of reduction and generalization techniques was done on purpose, i.e. for reasons of decency in relation to Indonesian cultural standards. Indonesian people, as also

agreed by the Senior Editor, have a conservative culture. As a general norm, children are supposed to be 'obedient' to their parents, and the general perception of a good child is one who is nicely behaved and does not confront their elders. This, among others, is reflected in the use of polite language. Children, therefore, are expected to get good reading material that contains good moral values and uses polite language as models. Being critical and showing some 'character' or showing be-yourself attitude, which might be perceived by the Western culture as positive qualities, may be considered negative in Indonesian culture. The communal nature of the society in Indonesia makes collectivity and harmony more preferable to individuality and privacy, and maintaining peaceful and harmonious relationship between children and parents is more important than self-expression. It was on this basis that the translation team, as the Senior Editor claimed, took decency as the first priority in translating, followed by clarity of meaning for the target readers and maintenance of humour.

Table 1. Translation techniques used

Technique	%
discursive creation	18.7
reduction	16.6
generalisation	13.7
established equivalence	9.3
linguistic compression	8.3
amplification	7.4
adaptation	6.3
literal translation	5.9
modulation	4.2
compensation	3.8
linguistic amplification	2.0
variation	1.2
particularization	1.1
borrowing	0.6
transposition	0.5
description	0.3
calque	0.3

The findings from the Senior Editor's written notes on the reasons for choosing the reduction and generalization techniques and from the interview revealed that censorship was partly made through the use of these translation techniques, and that this was done for the sake of receptivity and readership as well as maintenance of humour. When asked whether there was a reduction or loss of humour in cases where the reduction and generalization techniques were used, the Senior Editor claimed that the publisher and translation team would rather sacrifice humour than sacrifice the value of education for the children as they are the largest segment of readers. It was claimed that although the translated text might lose its humour, the overall story and the pictures could still give sufficient

humour. It was mentioned that the team had a slogan “pictures speak louder than the words.” It was further suggested that the publisher and the translation team had the responsibility to consider the educational element in their translation work.

The translators’ consideration of this educational element was in line with the statement made by Inggs (2003), suggesting that children’s literature has a dual role, i.e. forming the children’s own cultural identity and their view of the world as well as broadening their knowledge and understanding of other culture. Children’s literature, and also comics, have different roles; besides giving amusement, they develop the children’s reading skills, and they can be used as educational, social, and ideological tools. In addition, they can also be used to bring knowledge of the world, ideas, acceptable values and behavior. Didacticism, according to Puurtinen (1998) is always existent, implicitly or explicitly. Similarly, Nikolajeva (cited in Mdallel, 2003, p. 299) states that “children’s literature has from the very beginning been related to pedagogics” and that children’s literature has always been considered “a powerful means for educating children”.

In Indonesia, where the government policy is not so strict in terms of the entry of foreign translated works, as proven from the flood of comics and novels from the West and Japan, the task of filtering or censorship is partly in the translators’ hands; on them depend the translation quality, the flow of the story, readability, acceptability by the target readers, the rendering of cultural values, the maintenance of the cultural identity of the original, and to prevent the ‘contamination’ of unacceptable values. Thus, translators use censorship as reflected in their translation techniques. Censorship is not imposed by the government, but is the responsibility of the translators (and publishers).

Illustrating how reduction and generalization techniques were used for the sake of receptivity, the Senior Editor mentioned that such techniques were also used in cases where the scenes were sensitive in terms of SARA. SARA stands for *Suku* (ethnicity), *Agama* (religion), *Ras* (race) and *Antar-golongan* (inter-group). SARA is a concept introduced in the presidential period of Suharto, the second President of the Republic of Indonesia. With a large number of diverse ethnic groups, races, religions, the government of Indonesia had to apply certain preventive and anticipative measures to maintain harmony among the people. In doing so, the concept of SARA was introduced. Any offence related to SARA was considered subversive and was subject to a heavy penalty or imprisonment. Although the government is more open now, it seems that the concept of SARA is still perceived as a sensitive issue. In the case of censorship made by the translators, for example, words which might be negatively perceived by a certain religion would be

deleted or generalized/neutralized. There was a case of translating the sentence “feed the pigs!” into “*beri makan ternaknya!*” (back translation: “give food to the farm animal!”). In this case, the word “pigs” was changed to “farm animal” as “pigs” might be negative to Muslims, the majority in Indonesia. Religious expressions were also neutralized. For example, the exclamation “Oh my God!” was neutralized/generalized into “*ya ampun!*” (“oh my gosh!”) instead of “*ya Tuhan!*” (“Oh my God!”), avoiding the mention of the word “*Tuhan*” (“God”), because on one occasion the team received criticism from readers that the characters of the comics, the ducks and other animals, were not likely to relate to God in their lives. Another example was given in cases where they deleted such words as *bodoh* (“stupid”), *goblok* (“dumb”; “moronic”), etc.

A number of reductions were made by deleting mocking addressing or negative labelling of the characters and insults. For example, “that ugly guy” was translated to “*pria itu*” (“that guy”); “that fat pig” was translated to “*dia*” (“him”), “you termites” was translated to “*kalian*” (“you”), “you microbes” was translated to “*kalian*” (“you”), “you fragments” was translated to “*kalian*” (“you”), and other negative forms of address such as “criminy”, “philistine”, “buster”, “deranged”, “pig face”, “you clowns”, “quackface”, “dismal dunce” were all deleted. Similarly, descriptive words/phrases mocking the characters or their actions like “...and a puerile”, “stupid”, “nasty”, “weird”, “dumb”, and “my foot” were all deleted. This shows the general conservativeness of the culture in Indonesia. Some examples are given below:

Example (1)

Original English : I think that **ugly guy** is following me!
 Translated Indonesian: *Sepertinya pria itu mengikutiku!*
 Back translation : I think that **guy** is following me!

Example (2)

Original English : so get out and stay out, **you dismal dunce!**
 Translated Indonesian: *Keluar dan jangan kembali lagi!*
 Back translation : Get out and don’t come back!

Example (3)

Original English : Hey! What if I pulled off your **stupid** sailor suit?
 Translated Indonesian: *Hei! Bagaimana kalau aku yang menarik baju pelautmu itu?*
 Back translation : Hey! What if I pull off your sailor suit?

The examples (1) to (3) show deletion of words/phrases. In examples (1) and (3), the words “ugly” and “stupid” respectively were deleted, while

in example (2) the phrase "you dismal dunce" was deleted. There were also deletions of clauses/sentences. An example is given below:

Example (4)

Original English : **Stupid Shakespeare-hack!**
Stupid play! Nobody can
memorize that many lines!

Translated Indonesian: *Drama konyol! Mana ada
yang mampu menghafal semua
kata-katanya!*

Back translation : Foolish drama! How can one
be able to memorize all the
words!

It is interesting to see that the word "konyol" (foolish) is still permitted here; it allows the derision to shift from the person 'hacking' the play, but retains the idea of something being dumb/stupid.

An illustration taken from the comics showing an example of the reduction technique used by the translator can be seen in figure 1(a) and 1(b). In addition to the reduction technique, the generalization technique was also used by the translators as part of their censorship. One of the uses of this technique was to neutralize harsh language, such as in addressing the characters. For example, the word "scoundrel", which appeared several times was translated with "penjahat" ("criminal"), while the word "savage" and "scoundrel" in other cases were similarly translated into "perampok" ("robber"). This technique was also used to generalize the negative labelling of the characters as used in insults. For example, "ill-tempered barbarian" was translated to "lelaki yang gampang mengamuk" ("a man who easily go crazy"), "vile temper" was translated to "pemarah" ("temperamental"), "a pest" was translated to "payah" ("hopeless"), "termites" was translated to "anak-anak" ("kids"), "snottbeaks" was translated to "anak kecil" ("little kids"), and "morons!" was translated to a more neutral exclamation "dasar!" ("what a..!"). The following examples show how the generalization technique is used in the comic as part of the censorship:

Example (5)

Original English : But how **those termites**
engineered the trick is beyond
me!

Translated Indonesian: *Tapi bagaimana bisa anak-
anak merencanakan tipuan ini
padaku!*

Back translation : But how could **the kids** play
this trick on me!

Example (6)

Original English : But wait! This other **crook!**
He's... he's... he's not Gyro in
disguise?

Translated Indonesian: *Tunggu! **Penjahat** yang lain!
Dia... dia... bukan Lung yang
menyamar?*

Back translation : Wait! The other **criminal!**
He... he... not Lung in
disguise?

Example (7)

Original English : That's it! I don't want
anything to do with such a **nil-
tempered barbarian!**

Translated Indonesian: *Cukup! Aku tidak mau
berurusan dengan **lelaki yang
gampang mengamuk!***

Back translation : Enough! I don't want to deal
with a **man who easily goes
crazy!**

As mentioned above, the reduction and generalization techniques were mostly chosen to reduce sarcasm and insults. It should be noted, however, that there were also other uses of the techniques, i.e. to generalize words, phrases, and expressions which have no Indonesian corresponding equivalence. For example, as there are not many Indonesian words to express affection as there are in English, and as there are in the original English text of the comics, the words "Sweetie" and "Toots" were translated the same way to "Sayang" ("Love"), and the phrase "my little darlings" was translated to "anak-anak" ("Kids"); there are a lot of English vocatives to express love such as "Honey", "Darling", "Sweetheart", "Pumpkin", "Baby", "Babe", "Love", "Lovvie", etc., but there are perhaps only two such common Indonesian vocatives, i.e. "Sayang" or "Yang" for short ("Love"), and "Manis" ("Sweetie"). In addition, there are rich English expressions used in the comics which do not have the equivalent Indonesian expressions, so the exclamation "holy canolli!" was translated into the Indonesian general exclamation "astaga!" ("for heaven's sake"), and the expressions "are you off your rocker?" was translated to "yang benar saja!" ("get it right!"), "stay out of the can" was translated to "tidak dipenjara" ("not imprisoned"), "right on the ball" was translated to "punya naluri bisnis hebat" ("has great business instinct"), "dog-eat-dog world of door-to-door selling" was translated to "persaingan dunia sales" ("sales world competition").

The study investigated how the censorship through the choice of the translation techniques affected the readership as revealed from the responses of the English and Indonesian language 'experts', young readers, and parents. Their investigated responses were focused on the rendering of meaning, maintenance of humour, and acceptability of the translation.

The ‘expert’ readers consisted of two Indonesians who have outstanding command of English and Indonesian languages and both have the knowledge and experience of Western culture as well as practical experience of translating/interpreting and conducting research on translation, plus myself as the researcher. This group (labelled as ‘expert’ group for short) read the 21

comics, both the original English and the Indonesian translation; the 480 humorous utterances were marked and numbered 1 to 480. The group then assessed the accuracy of translation in terms of meaning. They were asked to mark 3 if the translation was accurate, 2 if it was not so accurate, and 1 if it was inaccurate. The recapitulation of the marking is given Table 2.

Table 2. Marking of the rendering of meaning

Evaluator	Marking of the Rendering of Meaning											
	Mark 3				Mark 2				Mark 1			
	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%
Researcher	267	35	302	62.92	75	97	172	35.83	5	1	6	1.25
‘Expert’ I	267	42	309	64.37	75	88	163	33.96	5	3	8	1.67
‘Expert’ II	267	85	352	73.33	75	38	113	23.54	5	10	15	3.13

Note: U=Unanimous; NU=Not Unanimous; F=Frequency

Out of the 480 pieces of data, 347 (72.29%) were marked unanimously by the three evaluators: 267 (55.62%) were marked 3, meaning that the meaning of the whole text was accurately rendered in the translation; 75 data (15.62%) were marked 2, meaning that the meaning of most part of the text was rendered, but part of the text was not accurately translated or missing; and 5 data (1.04%) were marked 1, meaning that the rendering of meaning was inaccurate or there was a distortion of meaning. This shows that on 267 data of utterances (55.62%) all the three evaluators agreed that the rendering of meaning was accurate, and the rest were not so accurate, with some loss of meaning and/or inaccurate or distorted. This finding is similar to the finding of the previous research on the Indonesian translation of the *Donald Duck* comics (Simanjuntak, 2006), which revealed that deletion

caused distorted meaning. In addition to the unanimously marked data, there were 133 utterances (27.71%) which were not unanimously marked. This shows discrepancy in the marking.

To investigate how the target readers viewed the translation in terms of clarity of meaning of the translated Indonesian texts they read, 3 children/teenagers (10, 15, and 17 years old) were asked to read the 21 Indonesian translated comics with the 480 humorous utterances marked with a highlighting pen and numbered 1 to 480. They were then given a scale sheet and asked to rate the clarity of meaning of the 480 utterances. They were asked to mark 3 if the meaning of the text was clear, 2 if it was not so clear, and 1 if the meaning was not clear at all. Table 3 shows the target readers’ assessment of the clarity of meaning of the Indonesian translated texts:

Table 3. Target readers’ assessment of clarity of meaning

Evaluator	Marking of the Clarity of Meaning											
	Mark 3				Mark 2				Mark 1			
	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%
Reader I	474	3	477	99.37	0	3	3	0.63	0	0	0	0
Reader II	474	3	477	99.37	0	3	3	0.63	0	0	0	0
Reader III	474	3	477	99.37	0	3	3	0.63	0	0	0	0

Note: U=Unanimous; NU=Not Unanimous; F=Frequency

As seen from the table above, out of the 480 utterances evaluated, 474 data (98.75%) were unanimously marked 3 by the 3 evaluators, and only 6 utterances (1.25%) were differently rated. The high mark given by the target readers shows that the readers were not confused by the text and that overall they were comfortable in the reading experience.

As mentioned earlier, translators, when translating texts for children, are faced with the responsibility of filtering or censorship and have to make decisions, whether to maintain the original texts or to make adjustments. Choosing to maintain the original texts means taking priority over

accuracy, but choosing to make adjustments for the sake of the target readers means taking priority over receptivity and readability. In the case of the English-Indonesian translation of humorous utterances of the *Donald Duck* comics, the translators chose to prioritise receptivity and readability over accuracy. It is understandable, therefore, that the assessment made by the ‘expert’ group revealed an agreed accuracy level of only 55.62%, but the target readers highly appreciated the clarity of the translation as shown from the high mark of utterances considered as clear in terms of meaning (99.37%). In other words, although part of the humorous texts was not correctly translated in

terms of rendering of the whole meaning, the translators succeeded in making the translation clear to its target readers. This means that the translators' intention to prioritise clarity over accuracy of meaning was achieved.

To investigate the effect of the censorship, as reflected in the choice of translation techniques, on

the maintenance of humour, the groups of 'experts' were asked to evaluate the maintenance of humour using a scale sheet; they were asked to mark 3 if the original humour was maintained in the translation, 2 if it was reduced, and 1 if it was lost. Recapitulation of their evaluation is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. 'Expert readers' marking of the maintenance of humour

Evaluator	Mark of the Maintenance of Humour											
	Mark 3				Mark 2				Mark 1			
	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%
Researcher	294	37	331	68.96	53	94	147	30.62	1	1	2	0.42
'Expert' I	294	38	332	69.17	53	92	145	30.21	1	2	3	0.62
'Expert' II	294	93	387	80.63	53	35	88	18.33	1	4	5	1.04

Note: U=Unanimous; NU=Not Unanimous; F=Frequency

Out of the 480 utterances in the humorous texts 348 pieces of data (72.50%) were unanimously marked: 294 utterances (61.25%) were marked 3, 53 utterances (11.04%) were marked 2, and only 1 utterance (0.21%) was marked 1. This shows that all the 3 evaluators agreed that 61.25% of the humour was maintained, 11.04% was reduced, and 0.21% was reduced. Besides the unanimous marking, there was disagreement among the evaluators in marking the maintenance of humour; 132 data (27.50%) were marked differently. This shows discrepancy of the marking of the 27.50% of the data. The researcher

and the 'expert' I seemed to have more or less similar marking, while 'expert' II showed different marking.

Evaluation of the humour was also made by the target readers and the parents. While the evaluation made by the 'expert' group involved reading and comparing the original English and Indonesian translated texts, that made by the target readers and parents involved reading of the translated Indonesian texts only. The evaluation of humour of the translated humorous utterances by the target reader group is given in Table 5.

Table 5. Target readers' marking of the humour

Evaluator	Marking of the Humour											
	Mark 3				Mark 2				Mark 1			
	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%
Reader I	252	127	379	78.96	22	44	66	13.75	14	21	35	7.29
Reader II	252	48	300	62.50	22	80	102	21.25	14	64	78	16.25
Reader III	252	46	298	62.08	22	78	100	20.83	14	68	82	17.08

Note: U=Unanimous; NU=Not Unanimous; F=Frequency

Table 5 above reveals that out of the 480 data, 288 data (60.00%) were unanimously marked by the three readers: 252 utterances (52.50%) were marked 3, 322 utterances (4.58%) were marked 2, and 14 utterances (2.92%) were marked 1. This shows that the 3 readers agreed that 52.50% of the (translated) humorous utterances were funny, whereas 4.58% were not so funny, and 2.92% were not funny at all. The remaining 192 utterances (40.00%) were marked

differently among the readers. This shows the discrepancy in the evaluation. It is interesting to note that Reader I seemed to assign different marking compared to Reader II and III. The reader I was the youngest (10 years old) and assigned more mark 3 than the older readers. Evaluation of the humour was also made by two parents as shown on Table 6.

Table 6. Parents' evaluation of humour of the translated texts

Evaluator	Mark of Humour											
	Mark 3				Mark 2				Mark 1			
	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%
Parent I	290	19	309	64.37	11	160	171	35.63	0	0	0	0
Parent II	290	153	443	92.29	11	17	28	5.83	0	9	9	1.88

Note: U=Unanimous; NU=Not Unanimous; F=Frequency

The findings reveal that out of the 480 data of humorous utterances, 301 data (62.71%) were unanimously marked by the two evaluators: 290 data (60.42%) were marked 3, and 11 data (2.29%)

were marked 2, and none was unanimously marked 1. This means that the two parents agreed that 60.42% of the (translated) humorous utterances were funny, and 2.29% were not so funny. The rest

179 data (37.29%) were marked differently by the parents. The discrepancy of this evaluation is greater, with parent I only assigned mark 3 for 19 utterances and parent II assigned mark 3 for 153 utterances. Also, parent I assigned mark 2 for 160 utterances and parent II assigned mark 2 for 17 utterances. Finally, parent I did not assign mark 1 for humour, and the parent II assigned mark 1 for 9 utterances. The two parents had different educational backgrounds (parent I held master degree in English education and parent II was high school graduate), but they were of the same ethnic group and religion.

The above findings show that not all the humorous messages contained in the original English texts were maintained in the Indonesian translated texts; the ‘expert’ group unanimously perceived that 61.25% of the humour was retained; the target readers (young readers) unanimously perceived that 52.50% of the (translated) humorous utterances were funny, and the parents (older readers) unanimously perceived that 60.42% of the humorous utterances were funny. The findings also show that the percentage of the humorous utterances retained, as perceived by the ‘expert’ group, was approximately the same as the percentage of the translated utterances perceived as funny by the older readers (parents), but was somewhat different from the percentage of those perceived as humorous by the younger readers. It is also interesting to note that in the evaluation of humour, there are discrepancies of evaluation among the evaluators, even of the same group. For example, among parents of different educational backgrounds there was great discrepancy of marking; however, in the ‘expert’ group, ‘expert I’ and ‘expert II’ showed different marking, although they were of equal educational

background. The marking within the young reader group also showed discrepancy.

All these findings showed that humour is subjective; what is considered funny to one person may not be funny to others, regardless of background. It is reasonable to tentatively conclude, however, that some of the humour in the source text was reduced or lost in the translated text. This is understandable as the reduction and generalization techniques have frequently reduced the sarcasm and insults, while some humour lies in the sarcasm and insults. As mentioned earlier, the translators would rather risk losing part of the humour than risking the decency and educational values of the work. It was believed that the translators also had to consider the educational value of their work, sacrificing some of the humour for the sake of decency or cultural acceptability. In addition, it is commonly believed that translating humour is not easy, and that reduced/lost humour in the translation is inevitable. Raphaelson-West in his article “*On the Feasibility and Strategies of Translating Humour*” (1989) states ‘It is possible to translate humour if you keep in mind that the translation will not always be as humorous as the original’.

To investigate the translation acceptability in terms of the appropriateness of the language, the parent group was asked to rate the language appropriateness of the humorous utterances for children/teenagers. They were asked to mark 3 if the language was appropriate for children/teenagers, 2 if it was not so appropriate, and 1 if it was not appropriate at all. Out of the 480 data, 477 data (99.37%) were unanimously marked 3 by both parents. Only 3 utterances (0.63%) were marked differently, and no mark 1 was assigned for language appropriateness, as seen from Table 7.

Table 7. Parents’ assessment of language appropriateness

Evaluator	Mark of Language Appropriateness											
	Mark 3				Mark 2				Mark 1			
	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%	U	NU	F	%
Parent I	477	2	479	99.79	0	1	1	0.21	0	0	0	0
Parent II	477	1	478	99.58	0	2	2	0.42	0	0	0	0

Note: U=Unanimous; NU=Not Unanimous; F=Frequency

This shows that the language of the translated humorous texts was highly appreciated by parents as appropriate for Indonesian children/teenagers. In other words, the censorship made by the translators through the reduction and generalization techniques has resulted in texts that conform to the parents’ expectations, meaning that the translated texts were highly acceptable.

From the findings and discussion above, it can be seen that translation techniques especially reduction and generalization, can be used to manipulate text for censorship in order to gain acceptable translation. In addition, translation techniques can also be intended to gain clarity of

meaning. It is therefore advisable to teach translation techniques in the teaching of translation.

CONCLUSION

Censorship done by the translators in translating the Walt Disney’s *Donald Duck* comics into Indonesian, through the use of the reduction and generalization techniques, has distorted some of the meanings. This is in line with the finding of the previous study (Simanjuntak, 2006). The findings also suggested that some of the humour contained in the original English text was reduced or lost. The reduced/lost humour was mostly affected by the reduction and

generalization techniques employed, as the techniques were meant, among others, to moderate or eliminate the insults and sarcasm, which actually created the humour in the original texts. However, the findings of the study also revealed that with such censorship, the translation was highly appreciated by children/teenagers as the target readers as being easy to read and gave them comfortable reading experience. The translated text was also highly appreciated by the parents as having appropriate language for children and teenagers.

Representing the translation team, the publisher's Senior Editor admitted that there were cases where the humour was intentionally reduced or generalized in the translated texts for the sake of decency by Indonesian cultural standards. It was further argued that decency was the first priority in translation decision making, followed by clarity of meaning and maintenance of humour.

The translators' purpose to prioritize decency was achieved, as the language of the translated text was highly rated by parent group as being appropriate. Similarly, their purpose to prioritize clarity of meaning was achieved as the target reader group highly rated the clarity of meaning. However, the translators' purpose to maintain humour was somewhat sacrificed when there was conflicting situation between maintaining decency or clarity of meaning and maintaining the humour. Further research is recommended to investigate other elements censored, and compared with other translated comics like *Tin Tin*. It is also recommended to teach translation techniques in translation class.

REFERENCES

- Apter, M. (1985). *Humour and laughter*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca.
- Audrieth, A.L. (1998). The art of using humour in public speaking. Retrieved from <http://www.squaresail.com/auh.html>
- Barker, M. (1989). *Comics: Ideology, power & the critics*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.
- Chiaro, D. (1992). *The Language of jokes: Analysing verbal play*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, M. (1999). *Just judgment: Censorship of and in Canadian literature*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Department of English, McGill University, Montréal, Canada. Retrieved from http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/R/?func=dbin-jump-ull&object_id=35866&local_base=GEN 01-MCG02
- Dynel, M. (2008). Introduction to special issue on humour: A modest attempt at presenting contemporary linguistic approaches to humour studies. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 4(1), *Special Issue on Humour*.
- Inge, M.T. (1990). *Comics as culture*. Jackson/London: University Press of Mississippi.
- Inggs, J. (2003). From Harry to Garri: Strategies for the transfer of culture and ideology in Russian translations of two English fantasy stories. *META: Translators' Journal*, 48(1-2), 285-297. Retrieved from www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2003/v48/n4/008747ar.html.
- Leonardi, V. (2008). Power and control in translation: Between ideology and censorship?. Retrieved from <http://lse2010.narod.ru/index/0-128>.
- Lin, J. (2016). Children's literature, translation, and censorship: The Spanish translations of Huckleberry Finn under Franco's dictatorship (1937-1975). (Unpublished Master Thesis) Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. The University of Sydney. Retrieved from https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/bitstream/2123/15509/1/thompson_jl_thesis.pdf
- Mdallel, S. (2003). Translating children literature in the Arab world: The state of the art. *META: Translators' Journal*, 48(1-2), 298-306. Retrieved from http://www.alsalwabooks.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=68&Itemid=89.
- Molina, L & Albir, A.H. (2002). Translation technique revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *META: Translators' Journal*, 47(4), 499-512. Retrieved from <http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsid=14447481>.
- Puurtinen, T. (1998). Syntax, readability and ideology in children's literature. *META: Translators' Journal*, 43(4). Retrieved from <http://terminologia.sslmit.unibo.it/bibliografia/search.php?search=browse&attributes%5B%5D=29>.
- Raphaelson-West, D.S. (1989). On the feasibility and strategies of translating humour. *META: Translators' Journal*, 34(1). Retrieved from www.erudit.org/iderudit/003913ar.pdf.
- Ross, A. (1998). *The Language of humour*. Routledge: London.
- Scandura, G.L. (2004). Sex, lies and TV: Censorship and subtitling. *META: Translators' Journal*, 49(1), 125-134. Retrieved from <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/009028ar>.
- Simanjuntak, F. (2006). Kajian terhadap strategi penerjemahan dan kualitas penerjemahan buku cerita komik The very Best of Donald Duck Comics dalam Bahasa Indonesia. (Unpublished Thesis). Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Sousa, C. (2002). TL versus SL implied reader: Assessing receptivity when translating

- children's literature. *META: Translators' Journal*, 47(1). Retrieved from <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/007988ar..>
- Sutopo, H.B. (2006). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif: Dasar teori dan terapannya dalam penelitian*. Edisi 2. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Zitawi, J.I. (2004). *The translation of Disney comics in the Arab world: A pragmatic perspective*. (Unpublished Dissertation). The University of Manchester. Retrieved from <https://www.iatis.org/newvoices/issues/2005/abs-ibrahim-NV2005.pdf>.
- Wolf, M. (2002). Censorship as cultural blockage: Banned literature in the late Habsburg monarchy. *TTR:traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 15(2), 45-61. Retrieved from <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/007478ar>.
- Yuliasri, I. (2011). *Kajian terjemahan Inggris-Indonesia teks humour dalam komik Walt Disney Donald Duck dari perspektif pragmatik*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Universitas Sebelas Maret.